

Rolf Frankenbach
Program Manager, IRWM Planning Grants
California Department of Water Resources
Division of Integrated Regional Water Management
Financial Assistance Branch
Post Office Box 942836
Sacramento, CA 94236
rfranken@water.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Frankenbach,

Please find my comments on the draft Round 2 Planning Grant PSP itemized below.

- P. 6, at the end of the first paragraph under B. Eligible Applicant, the dollar figures are incorrect in the last sentence. They should be \$750,000 and \$250,000 respectively.
- P. 6, in the very last paragraph on the page, it should read “eligibility in this solicitation: **surface** water diversion...”
- The PSP does not mention a match waiver or reduction for planning efforts involving or being undertaken by disadvantaged communities. I would encourage DWR to consider providing a match waiver for DAC projects, particularly since there is a minimum amount that must be spent on proposals that encourage the participation of DACs in IRWM planning efforts. This would provide more incentive to incorporate DACs into the proposal.
- P. 11, in the paragraph just above Table 3: I would suggest just changing the nomenclature used in BMS to match that used in the PSP, if possible.
- P. 11, the last word of the last paragraph above Table 3 should be “parentheses”.
- In Table 3, in Q1 under the Applicant Information and Question’s Tab (p. 12), there needs to be a period at the end of the first sentence.
- In the introductory information under the Application Attachments Tab of Table 3 (p. 13), I would recommend that the wording “DWR strongly recommends that for speed of upload you limit the file size to 20 MB” also be included in the earlier discussion about file sizes on p. 10.
- P. 16, first full paragraph under Attachment 4. Budget. Third sentence should read: “In the table, **for** each work plan task, a budget line item estimate...”
- P. 17, second line, “performed” is spelled incorrectly.
- P. 17, the last sentence of the AB 1420 Compliance paragraph is incomplete.
- In Table 4, under the Work Plan scoring criteria, my suggestion is to include the three elements or sections of the Work Plan as discussed on p. 15. I think this will help make it more clear to applicants not only what needs to be included but that those elements will also be part of the scoring for this criterion.
- Under the Program Preference part of Table 4, the second preference: there needs to be a space between “a” and “hydrologic”.
- Regarding the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Preference in Table 4: I understand that these are taken straight from the guidelines, but I would like to go on record to state that

this program preference prioritizes one region and issue in California over all others, and many regions will have no opportunity to earn this point. Even with only five maximum points being awarded, it just means that regions with no connection to the Bay-Delta have an extra responsibility of addressing the other program preferences. It's simply a matter of equitable consideration of all IRWM regions.

Thank you for providing us an opportunity to comment on the draft Round 2 Planning Grant PSP. I look forward to seeing the final version.

Most sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Holly Alpert".

Holly Alpert, Ph.D.

Program Manager

Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Program

PO Box 3442

Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

760-709-2212

holly@inyomonowater.org